of Commissioners and the Matron respectively as "an old fool" and "a peacock" (27), with cruelty resulting in the suicide of a woman whom he had confined to her room, and with stealing carrots for his horse. In November the sexton investigating the lightness of the coffin of a deceased patient on its way to burial in potter's field, discovered that someone had removed an arm, a leg, and the head for "anatomical purposes" (28).

The editors of the Upper Canada Journal of Medical Surgical and Physical Science created a narrative based on reports culled from various "city papers" (378).[h] In their account two merchants, Whittemore and Brewer, visited Potter's Field in November 1851 and noticed that a coffin, which they knew had been sent from the Lunatic Asylum, seemed unnaturally light. The coroner's jury subsequently discovered that Dr. Scott had performed a post mortem on the body after Mr. Coroner Duggan's own examination. Dr. King decided not to pursue the matter, but the Board of Commissioners of the Lunatic Asylum censured Scott for "`indiscretion and a want of judgment'" (379).

The editors felt that these events touched on some important points of public interest. While respectful toward the public's sensitivities to human dissection, they insist that it was of utmost importance to medical science. Moreover the public's sensitivities would not have been so offended, had Scott and other officers at the Asylum merely taken the precuation of securing the coffin before sending it to Potter's Field. Then the public would have been as ignorant (and uncaring) whether the body of Andrews, a pauper lunatic, rotted or pickled "as it is what the Cham of Tartary eats for lunch" (379). The grizzly comparison identifies the lunatic's hacked-up corpse with meat "consumed" far from anyone's knowledge or concern. While the tenor of the article is to endorse such removal and to fault not the procedure but the bringing of it to public notice, the editors claim to be concerned about the effect of such stories on the inmates.

The principal objects of editorial censure are not the doctors but Whittemore and Brewer, who, according to the editors, would not have broadcast their discovery had they really been motivated by human sympathy. The editors desired to know why the pair investigated the coffin in the first place. They suggested that it had something to do with ""the furtherance of private views or the display of political partizanship" (38). Thus they turn the